

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

There is no question that today, among the confederate-descended generation dwelling in the region which constituted the Confederacy, the second place in regard and confidence has been accorded to Davis. The first is unquestionably held by Lee. Throughout what was the Confederacy Lee is looked upon with affection and respect, and with an admiration accorded to no other political character since the day of Washington. He stands second among the great Virginians; if indeed not upon an equality with the greatest. It is somewhat otherwise as respects Davis. During the time immediately subsequent to the collapse of the Confederate cause he was held to a certain degree responsible for that collapse. It was attributed largely to his failure to grasp the possibilities of the situation; to make the best selection of agents; to avail fully of the resources of the South. Diplomatic errors, errors of finance, mistaken judgments as to men, were attributed to him. Reviewing, however, the whole field in the light of the fuller records now accessible, and from the standpoint of forty years later, it may confidently be said that these adverse judgments have undergone, and are now undergoing, material revision. It is today generally conceded that Jefferson Davis was not only a man of high character and great ability, but that he, so to speak, fought the Confederacy for all it was worth, that he was responsible for no very considerable error of judgment, and that the failure of the cause entrusted to him was due to inherent weaknesses which neither he nor any other man could have made good.

This Professor Dodd fairly shows in a presentation which is deserving of wide and thoughtful consideration, especially at the North.

CHARLES F. ADAMS.

The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz. Volume I. 1829–1852. Volume II. 1852–1863. (New York: The McClure Company. 1907. Pp. 406; 467.)

Is there another autobiographical or biographical work in the English language which presents greater contrasts, in matter and in manner, than this? The career of Carl Schurz was unique and one would expect a vast difference between the story of his youth and that of his mature manhood. We may make allowances for the fact that the scene of the first volume is his native land and that its events are the share of a hot-headed young man in an attempt at a revolution, whereas the second volume narrates his rise as a serious politician in a strange country and as a general in a civil war. But that accounts for the difference only partially. One has almost the feeling that the two volumes do not deal with the same man. Indeed, in the student at Bonn, in the aide-de-camp of Anneke at Kaiserslautern, pointing an empty pistol at a priest in a comic-opera arrest of the good man, in the daring rescuer of Kinkel from the penitentiary at Spandau—in the character thus portrayed there is not the slightest hint of the man he afterward

became. It follows as a matter of course that in the country lawyer of Wisconsin, in the oratorical champion of slavery, and particularly in the statesman of the last forty years, the story of which he did not live to finish, one can detect nothing which suggests his stormy and lawless youth. Moreover, although Mr. Schurz was doubtless unconscious of it, the style of the two volumes differs greatly, too greatly to be explained by the fact that the first was written in German, and translated admirably, whereas the second was written originally in English.

There is a like difference in the interest of the two volumes, at least to the American who is familiar with the political history of his country. The first deals with a revolutionary movement in a country which was not the chief scene of revolutionary disturbance, at a time when revolution was in the air of many European countries. For the very reason that the events narrated took place in Prussia and not in France, the story possesses historical importance; and Schurz's own part in it we follow, now with amusement at the audacity of the insurgents, now with almost breathless interest in the writer's adventures—his flight after the failure of the enterprise; his escape from Rastatt through a sewer and his forlorn journey to Switzerland; his plot, under an assumed name, finally successful, for the rescue of Kinkel, under the very noses of Prussian officers who could have arrested him and sent him to trial for his life; and the escape to Scotland.

There is not a thrill in the second volume. We see the same man nominated for lieutenant-governor of Wisconsin less than seven years after he first set foot in a country where English was spoken, when his only knowledge of the language was the two words "beefsteak" and "sherry", and we follow his brilliant career as an orator, a foreign minister and a civil-war general to the spring of 1863. So far as the narrative is personal it is interesting, but not absorbingly so. It throws no new light upon public events, Mr. Schurz was not the sort of man whom managing politicians—not using the term in a bad sense—take into their confidence, and consequently his reminiscences reveal nothing that was not already known. One result of the fact that his intercourse with public men was always serious is that there is a lack of anecdote, and a lack of the human element in the characterization of those men, that make the volume rather dull reading to one familiar with the political history of the time, until one comes to the war episode in his life.

Nevertheless, the very features of the work which detract something from our interest, point to positive virtues in Mr. Schurz's character. He was too serious, too high-minded, too sturdily and constantly devoted to his own principles, to think of commingling light matter with the moral lessons of the events in which he bore a part. He fancied, in one or two passages he says, in effect, that he was not uncharitable toward those who differed from him. But he was. He

was so sure that he was right, and so earnest in hoping and working that the right might prevail, that he could not believe in the sincerity of an opportunist. So he was the worst and most intractable of party men, indeed, not a party man at all. Whether wise or mistaken in his view as to the most effective means of accomplishing this or that desired object, his conscientious and resolute adherance to what he conceived to be right entitles him always to the highest respect.

Yet he had his weaknesses. One does not really know whether to take his modest expressions of surprise at his own success as an orator in the United States as expressions of modesty or as manifestations of pardonable vanity. For he gives too many instances of his oratorical achievements to leave the impression that he wishes to suppress all that are unnecessary. In one case he has fallen into an amusing error. In 1859 he went to Boston and made an address on the "True Americanism". The Massachusetts general court had submitted to the people an amendment of the state constitution requiring foreign-born citizens to reside in the United States two years after naturalization before acquiring the right to vote in the commonwealth. Mr. Schurz's account of the Know-Nothing movement, if read by one unacquainted with political history, would lead that reader to suppose that the movement was in its incipient stage in 1859, whereas the Know-Nothing party had been dead in all the Northern states for three years. Mr. Schurz reports that this address was very warmly applauded, that he "received no end of compliments", and that he was told that the printed report produced an excellent effect in the interior of the state. He adds: "Perhaps it did contribute a little to the defeat of the 'two years' amendment'." But the amendment was not defeated. The people accepted it on May 9, 1859, by a vote of 20,753 to 15,129 and Governor Banks proclaimed it on May 20. It was annulled by popular vote in 1863.

It is not to be expected that a work of this sort should be free from mistakes, and Schurz can easily be pardoned for thinking that on this visit to Boston he was entertained at a dinner in "one of the patrician houses of the town". But how can one account for the remarkable misunderstanding of a situation, or lapse of memory, which is contained in his version of the circumstances in which he was appointed Minister to Spain? A comparison of that account with an extract from the diary of the late Hon. Charles Francis Adams, dated March 10, 1861, which his son, the present Charles Francis Adams, read at the meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, June, 1907, reveals irreconcilable differences; and certainly a strictly contemporaneous narrative is likely to be more nearly correct than Mr. Schurz's memory of what took place forty years before.

A review of so attractive a work by so eminent a public man should not end with what may seem a carping criticism; for after all it is a worthy record of a great career.

EDWARD STANWOOD.